

REMARKS

The Office Action dated June 11, 2007 has been reviewed, and the comments of the U.S. Patent Office have been considered. All of the pending claims have been amended and claim 30 has been added.

Claim Objections

Claim 26 was found objectionable for being informal. Claim 26 has been amended to correct the identified informality.

Rejection under 35 USC 103

Claims 1 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,476,592 to Simard in view of US 6,716,356 to Collins et al, claims 9 and 18 were rejected in further view of US 5,441,636 to Chevallet et al. The Office Action relies on Simard for its disclosure of a hemofiltration system. Collins is relied upon for the teaching that multiple fluids can be combined and filtered to form a replacement fluid and that this teaching would be applicable to Simard.

Collins shows combining water, acid concentrate 150 and bicarbonate concentrate 152 so the purpose of having multiple fluid sources is that their combination is required to generate the substitution fluid. Thus, Collins does not teach to combine multiple fluid sources in the absence of a need to combine fluids to generate a substitution fluids from components thereof. In addition, Collins shows respective pumps for each of the acid and concentrate fluids. It would have been clear to a person of ordinary skill in the art that in order to generate a substitution fluid, precise ratios of the combined fluids would have to be maintained by flow regulation, such as by such respective pumps. Thus, Collins teaches to combine different fluids in controlled ratios to achieve a combination that can restore a patient's fluid balance. Thus, Collins would only commend the use of an apparatus with multiple inputs where different substances had to be combined to provide a proper substitution fluid. Therefore, Collins it would not commend the use of multiple inputs to connect "containers containing the same replacement fluid" as required by the claim.

Claim 9 recites: "each of the multiple connectors being connected to a respective one of multiple replacement fluid containers, each of which contains sterile replacement fluid effective

to restore a normal electrolyte balance of human blood.” Thus, claim 9 would not result from a modification of Simard according to the teachings of Collins. Claim 18 recites “wherein said input end of said replacement fluid line has a branching connector with multiple ends connected to multiple sources of a same infusible replacement fluid.” Thus claim 18, also, would not result from a modification of Simard according to the teachings of Collins. Claim 26 recites “a sterilizing filter connected to multiple connector leads ... there being no flow regulating portions between the connector leads and the sterilizing filter.” Thus, claim 26 would also not result from a modification of Simard according to the teachings of Collins because Collins fails to teach multiple connector leads in the absence of the required flow regulating portions.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this Application. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution of the application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-3840. **This paragraph is intended to be a CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).**

Date: 10/3/07
Patent Administrator
Proskauer Rose LLP
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: 202.416.6800
Facsimile: 202.416.6899
CUSTOMER NO: 61263

Respectfully submitted,



Mark A. Catan
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 38,720

Customer No. 61263